



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,982	12/06/2001	Gee-Hong Kuo	ORT-1551	5874

27777 7590 10/01/2003
AUDLEY A. CIAMPORCERO JR.
JOHNSON & JOHNSON
ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA
NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003

EXAMINER
COLEMAN, BRENDA LIBBY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1624	

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/008,982

Applicant(s)

KUO ET AL.

Examiner

Brenda L. Coleman

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 13-17 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 18-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 7, 8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-39 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 26, 27 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The scope of the method claims is not adequately enabled solely based on protein kinase inhibition provided in the specification. Evidence involving a single compound and two types of cancer was not found sufficient to establish the enablement of claims directed to a method of treating seven types of cancer with members of a class of several compounds. In re Buting 163 USPQ 689. The remarkable advances in chemotherapy have seen the development of specific compounds to treat specific types of cancer. The great diversity of diseases falling within the "tumor" category means that it is contrary to medical understanding that any agent (let alone a genus of thousands of compounds) could be generally effective against such diseases. The intractability of these disorders is clear evidence that the skill level in this art is low relative to the difficulty of the task.

There never has been a compound capable of treating cancer generally. There are compounds that treat a range of cancers, but no one has ever been able to figure

Art Unit: 1624

out how to get a compound to treat cancer generally, or even a majority of cancers.

Thus, the existence of such a "silver bullet" is contrary to our present understanding in oncology. Even the most broadly effective antitumor agents are only effective against a small fraction of the vast number of different cancers known. This is true in part because cancers arise from a wide variety of sources, such as viruses (e.g. EBV, HHV-8, and HTLV-1), exposure to chemicals such as tobacco tars, genetic disorders, ionizing radiation, and a wide variety of failures of the body's cell growth regulatory mechanisms. Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm to the body, and different vulnerabilities. Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists today to get an agent to be effective against cancers generally, evidence that the level of skill in this art is low relative to the difficulty of such a task.

Where the utility is unusual or difficult to treat or speculative, the examiner has authority to require evidence that tests relied upon are reasonably predictive of in vivo efficacy by those skilled in the art. See *In re Ruskin*, 148 USPQ 221; *Ex parte Jovanovics*, 211 USPQ 907; MPEP 2164.05(a).

Patent Protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable. Tossing out the mere germ of an idea does not constitute enabling disclosure. *Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk* 42 USPQ2d 1001.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1624

2. Claims 1-12 and 18-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following reasons apply:

a) Claims 1-5, 8-12 and 18-39 recite the limitation "-NR₉-C(O)- and -C(O)-NR₉-" in the proviso with respect to the definition of R₂. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. See page 113, line 16; page 118, line 9; page 124, line 16; and page 129, line 22.

b) Claims 1-9, 11, 12 and 18-39 are vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by "(halo)₁₋₃" in the definition of the substituents on the alkyl, alkenyl and alkynyl moieties of R₁ and R₂. See page 114, line 21; page 120, lines 11 and 27; page 125, line 22; and page 130, line 28.

c) Claim 6 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the moiety -NR₆-(CH₂)₁₋₆-NR₇ -(CH₂)₁₋₆-NR₈- in the definition of R₂. See page 119, line 19.

d) Claims 18-39 are vague and indefinite in that the claim provides for the use of claimed compounds, but the claim does not set forth any steps involved in determining which disorders are mediated by the activity of the various types of kinase inhibitors. Determining whether a given disease responds or does not respond to such an inhibitor will involve undue experimentation. Suppose that a given drug, which has inhibitor properties in vitro, when administered to a patient with a certain disease, does not produce a favorable response. One cannot conclude that specific disease does not fall within this claim. Keep in mind that:

Art Unit: 1624

A. It may be that the next patient will respond. No pharmaceutical has 100% efficacy. What success rate is required to conclude our drug is a treatment? Thus, how many patients need to be treated? If "successful treatment" is what is intended, what criterion is to be used? If one person in 10 responds to a given drug, does that mean that the disease is treatable? One in 100? 1,000? 10,000? Will the standard vary depending on the current therapy for the disease?

B. It may be that the wrong dosage or dosage regimen was employed. Drugs with similar chemical structures can have markedly different pharmacokinetics and metabolic fates. It is quite common for pharmaceuticals to work and or be safe at one dosage, but not at another that is significantly higher or lower. Furthermore, the dosage regimen may be vital -- should the drug be given e.g. once a day, or four times in divided dosages? The optimum route of administration cannot be predicted in advance. Should our drug be given as a bolus iv or in a time release po formulation. Thus, how many dosages and dosage regimens must be tried before one is certain that our drug is not a treatment for this specific disease?

C. It may be that our specific drug, while active in vitro, simply is not potent enough or produces such low concentrations in the blood that it is not an effective treatment of the specific disease. Perhaps a structurally related drug is potent enough or produces high enough blood concentrations to treat the disease in question, so that the first drug really does fall within the claim. Thus, how many different structurally related inhibitors must be tried before one concludes that a specific compound does not fall within the claim?

Art Unit: 1624

D. Conversely, if the disease responds to our second drug but not to the first, both of which are inhibitors in vitro, can one really conclude that the disease falls within the claim? It may be that the first compound result is giving the accurate answer, and that the success of second compound arises from some other unknown property, which the second drug is capable. It is common for a drug, particularly in CNS disorders, cardiovascular disorders, cancer treatment, etc., to work by many mechanisms. The history of psychopharmacology is filled with drugs, which were claimed to be a pure receptor XYZ agonist or antagonist, but upon further experimentation shown to affect a variety of biological targets. In fact, the development of a drug for a specific disease and the determination of its biological site of action usually precede linking that site of action with the disease. Thus, when mixed results are obtained, how many more drugs need be tested?

E. Suppose that our drug is an effective treatment of the disease of interest, but only when combined with some totally different drug. There are for example, agents in antiviral and anticancer chemotherapy, which are not themselves effective, but are effective treatments when the agents are combined with something else.

Consequently, determining the true scope of the claim will involve extensive and potentially inconclusive research. Without it, one skilled in the art cannot determine the actual scope of the claim. Hence, the claim is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-5, 8-12 and 18-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by HEATH et al., EP 0 657 458. HEATH teaches the compounds, compositions and method of use of the compounds of formula I where Z is O; both E's are hydrogen substituted carbon atom; R₄ is -(CH₂)₃-; R₅ is -(CH₂)₃-; and R₂ is S. See example 50 on page 49.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 8-12 and 18-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HEATH et al., EP 0 657 458. The generic structure of HEATH encompasses the instantly claimed compounds (see Formula I, page 4) and for the same uses as claimed herein. Example 50 differs from the compounds of Formula I only in the nature of the X, Y and R₁ substituents. Page 4, lines 27-30 defines the substituent X and Y as independently C₁-C₄ alkylene, substituted alkylene, or together X, Y and W combine to form -(CH₂)_n-AA- and R₁ is defined as independently hydrogen, halo, C₁-C₄ alkyl, hydroxy, C₁-C₄ alkoxy, haloalkyl, nitro, NR₄R₅ or -NHCO(C₁-C₄ alkyl). Compounds of the instant invention are generically embraced by HEATH in view of the interchange ability of X, Y and R₁ substituents of the bis-indolemaleimide ring system. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to select for example F, nitro, OMe, etc. as well as other possibilities from the generically disclosed alternatives of the reference and in so doing obtain the instant compounds in view of the equivalency teachings outlined above.

Art Unit: 1624

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 13-17 are allowed. None of the prior art of record nor a search in the pertinent art area teaches the compounds of the instant invention as claimed herein.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brenda L. Coleman whose telephone number is 703-305-1880. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mukund Shah can be reached on 703-308-4716. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1235.



Brenda Coleman
Primary Examiner Art Unit 1624
September 30, 2003